241 it reverted to the Crown, C, as grandson of the main original
423 vendor, regarded himself as having a right in the abandoned pro-
472 perty. After some years of negotiating he now has a ninety-nine
[427] year lease at an annual rental of $7.95. Here he has planted cocoa and coconut trees.

At any time during his twenty years' employment D could have returned to his home area and planted cash crops on the ample family lands there. It was only when the opportunity arose of a [654] resettlement block with a development loan of $1,500 that he [426] decided to undertake cash-cropping; he has now planted over 3,000 cocoa trees.

472 Few Orokaiva are short of land in the area east of Popondetta
423 where the entrepreneurs are located. Land availability is not a factor differentiating entrepreneurs from villagers, but the availability of land other than that held under customary tenure may well be.

241 The entrepreneurs appear to be more efficient food gardeners
472 than many Orokaiva, for even though they average less time garden-
184 ing (see Table 6) they have more extensive gardens, as shown in the following table.

Table 1

Area of land under cultivation for food gardens
(acres)

	Per head of population	Per able-bodied person over 16	Per household
A's hamlet*	-	-	1.45
B's household	1.20	1.20	3.61
C's household	0.67	2.36	4.72
D's household**	0.75	1.50	3.00
Average	0.65	1.26	3.19
Average for Inonda and Sivepe***	0.34	0.69	1.48

* Measured for the six household heads in A's hamlet in December 1965 at the end of a long drought. They estimated their normal garden area to be nearly double this. A lives in a hamlet com-
[592] prising himself, his brothers and some of his married children. The hamlet is a short distance from the village of Kapurahambo.

** Estimated, not measured.

*** From Crocombe and Hogbin 1963b:10, and Rimoldi 1966:19. Inonda
[361] is a village on the sparsely settled plain, Sivepe village is located in the more fertile hilly country where population is denser. They were chosen as apparently representative of the two major ecological zones inhabited by the Orokaiva. All four entrepreneurs live in the former, plain zone.

A. [Table 6 appears in Category 461, p.19--Analyst]

463 The five subjects who had hired labourers who were not related
472 to them all paid cash wages. A and H have received $1,500 govern-
464 ment loans to develop their blocks and have thus had the capital
426 to pay for labour. They have not relied on kinship assistance at
657 all. The loan has been an effective substitute for kin ties. L derives the capital necessary to hire labour from her trade store.

463 It will be noted that all non-relatives are paid in cash, but
472 most relatives are paid in kind. Most entrepreneurs are still
465 dependent on the help of relatives, as they do not have the cash to pay hired labour, and are thus forced, willingly or not, to exploit their kinship ties.

464 Property

602 Land and cash crops. Most of the twelve subjects did not have any records of cash crop production or sales, so it was impossible
463 to calculate their success in cash-cropping according to these two
472 criteria. For this reason their cash-cropping activity has been assessed in terms of the number of economic trees each has planted.

423 Ten of the twelve entrepreneurs have cash crops, and another has
245 cleared land for 500 coffee trees. The following table shows that the most successful entrepreneurs have the fewest cash crops. The
[426 largest cash croppers (A, D and H) have leases of government land
427 and government development loans of $1,500, but even when they are
657] omitted the proportions between the three groups remain similar.

Table 13

Commercial trees owned by each entrepreneur*

Entrepreneur	Coffee	Coconut	Cocoa	Total economic trees	Title to land	Years since cash-cropping began	Average trees
A	100	-	1,085	1,185	L	3	
B	-	-	-	-	-	-	702
C	334	88	-	422	C	?	
D	-	-	1,200	1,200	L	4	
E	1,600	11	-	1,611	C	20	
F	300	46	100	446	C	9	1,800
G	388	52	-	440	C	7	
H	-	-	4,702	4,702	L	4	
I	-	170	200	370	C	11	
J	intends to plant	-	-	-	C	-	168
K	150	-	-	150	C	9	
L	150	-	-	150	C	10	

* Coconut and other trees used for home consumption only have been excluded.

474 177 241 share to the owner of the land. This activity started some time after 1947 and ceased with the eruption of Mount Lamington. It involved "everybody" at Pamba. At Inonda, both rice and peanuts were tried out. The rice was planted in one block, without subdivisions; it was hulled and sold at Higaturu government station, the money was distributed. There were two harvests between the time people started to grow rice and the time of the eruption, when rice was abandoned. Proceeds were 18 pounds and nine pounds; people's shares were two to three pounds each. The mission had nothing to do with the activity, but only the government, so I was told.

The evidence, limited as it is, leads one to wonder whether the rice produced by the cooperatives was really unsaleable, as Dakeyne suggests (1966: 61-62). On the other hand, there is no doubt that the mission lacked any marketing facilities and I would strongly agree with Dakeyne that the cooperative movement could never have succeeded except on the basis of cash sales for good prices. Sivepa, acting under mission influence, ate their own rice and did not attempt to sell it. When the people came back after the eruption, the rice was "spoiled," the deacon had been transferred to another station. In Inonda, the crop had likewise been "spoiled." Dakeyne reports that in 1951, the rice was attacked by a species of "army worm;" the District Agricultural Officer ordered all crops destroyed.

474 241 [427] The pattern of production of the Sivepa rice resembles that of the communal yam gardens. There also, several men may plant together in the garden of one of them; the users are then expected to make a gift of yams to the owner before taking away their own. If we put this strictly in contractual terms, a man leases land to others for one year for a fee. The lessees, together with the owner (who retains one section for himself), club together as a kind of working bee for the planting and harvesting (and perhaps some other operations). This traditional pattern was revived after the eruption in the establishment of coffee and rubber stands. Its significance, however, is somewhat changed if such common cultivations are carried on not for the sake of growing food for feasts (such as the yams), but for cash (as in the case of rubber and coffee and perhaps rice). When a common plot is established for cash crops (but not yams), the Sasembata district people call this a "company;" they speak of "company land"--the word "company" being a borrowed English word incorporated in Orokaiva vocabulary. This word has mildly millennial overtones: a "company" is the means by which the Orokaiva may acquire wealth equal to that of [829] the Europeans. It would be unfair to say, with Kleekham, that the "company" of the Orokaiva is a mystical and magical device; it is in fact a representation of what Orokaiva believe European business to be like.

471 [596] Today, Sivepa has three forms of economic organisation. The dominant one is that where the factors of production are entirely provided by the extended family and where the product is appropriated by the extended family also. This sytem applies to subsistence as

471 well as cash crops. The clan or village has overriding rights to the product only when a feast is being held; at such a time, people are encouraged to make extra plantings and are expected to donate what has been grown in excess to their own requirements. Such donations are represented as "voluntary" by informants.

471 The second type of organisation is that brought about by the
241 Australian government's insistence on the planting of village quota's
621 of rubber and coconut. Here, as I explained, an undivided area was planted by "all" members of the community, and the product appropriated by individuals on a sort of roster system. The land remains owned by the individual who made it available and it will revert to him when the trees die off. It is only the trees that are "communally" owned. There is no traditional precedent for this kind of arrangement.

471 The third type is that described on the preceding page. For
241 this system, the selected plot of land is divided into sections called
427 tane. This is common procedure also when subsistence crops are planted. Each tane is then lent to a person who will plant coffee or rubber there. This lending of tane is likewise traditional; a man described how his sister, after a quarrel, came back to Sivepe (she had married out) and he at once gave her a tane from his new garden to look after. The only difference, in the case of tree crops, is that the tane is lent out for a longer period, in fact as long as the borrower continues to harvest the trees (regularly). No new "communal" coffee plots of this sort have been established in Sivepe for many years; there was, however, such a plot allocated to rubber around 1964, as I have described. It was called a "company" and the agricultural officer told me that the government did not like supporting these "companies," preferring development of "individual holdings."

479 In the neighbouring village of Sasembata, where a rubber cooper-
245 ative was set up, a new variant developed in 1967. This was also called a "company;" its main asset was a small factory for processing the rubber. The "company" was also allocated a plot of land, owned by a village man, where trees were planted by a work group, with the intention of tapping and selling the rubber for the benefit of the company--there was some talk of saving up for a truck to cart the rubber and other village products. In addition, villagers planted trees on their individual land and rubber harvested from that land would be processed at the factory and proceeds would go to the grower. This scheme met with some sturdy opposition from the agricultural officer. The fear of the administration was always: cargo cults, communism, fraudulent accounting. Four Sivepe men were actively occupied for some weeks on helping to build the rubber factory. They also contributed $10 membership fee. Members were drawn from all villages closely related to Sasembata.

479 Cooperative principles were also not infrequently followed
443 in the setting up of trade stores. Rimoldi (1963) reported one such venture, involving 11 villages and centred on the Sasembata mission station. The savings seem to have totalled $60 from each of 12 clans,

27: Schwimmer E-5 (1966-1970) 1979 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

is the contemporary case where money replaces traditional valuables. Is this money a 'use value'? Anthropologists have often analyzed it as such and not without some justification; the Orokaiva for instance present brideprice banknotes tied one by one to a tall sapling carried aloft by the donor and thus transported to the wifegiver. After presentation it is often stored in wait for other similar occasions. The fact is, however, that eventually this treasure is converted into exchange values. Furthermore, it owes its status as a valuable to its potential exchange value. It is therefore more easily accounted for in the preset four-system method of analysis as will appear later.

The same remark may be made in respect of labour assistance between households which is normally given without payments except for a meal at the end of the day. If, however, the service is given in connection with work for which the person assisted will eventually get paid, then the service falls within a different category and must be paid for. The same rule applies to the granting of land useholds for which no rent is ever demanded if the land produces (only) use values, but the situation changes when it produces exchange values. Use value is therefore a concept determining Orokaiva behaviour.

Finally, it is as true of the Orokaiva as of the ancient Greeks that conflict and war (*isoro*) did not have a necessarily negative connotation connotation. They might be bad or good according to circumstances. War, sorcery and other forms of negative reciprocity are part of this mode of production; they cannot be equated to 'alienation'. There is increasing evidence that Levi-Strauss (1943) was correct in viewing war in these societies as a modality of interdependence.

To sum up, the Orokaiva had a basic classification of *pure* as between subsistence and feasting. An inspection of the crop by the feast-giver was needed to let crops pass from the subsistence to the feasting category. (It was not done if the harvest was insufficient.) The term *pure ari*, whatever its customary translation into English, was never used to denote any kind of effectiveness in ensuring a food supply. In case of garden failure, people did not ascribe it to neglectful *pure ari* but rather to neglectful *simbari*. It is the demigods of the various crops and the ancestors who do the actual producing in the garden, and all that is expected of man is to clear, to plant and to protect against magical and technical dangers. Watchfulness is the key; toil is a consequence. A flawless garden testifies to watchfulness in the first instance; to physical prowess also, but only in the second instance. In this respect i.e. the technical as well as the magical watchfulness, *pure ari* is intermediate between the Greek concepts of ΕΡΓΟΝ and ΤΕΧΝΗ.